II.—ANNOUNCEMENTS.

(1) Message from the Governor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I have received a message from the Governor of Madras recommending to the Legislative Cuncil the consideration of the Glanders and Farcy (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1965.

(2) Message from the Assembly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I have also received a message from the the Hon. Speaker, Legislative Assembly, transmitting a copy of the Madras General Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 36 of 1965), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, and signed by him for the recommendation of the Council and certifying that the Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of Article 199 of the Constitution of India.

I have further received messages from the Hon. Speaker, Legislative Assembly, transmitting copies of the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Continuance) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 37 of 1965), and the Glanders and Farcy (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1965 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1965) as passed by the Legislative Assembly and signed by him for the concurrence of the Council.

I have further received a message from the Hon. Speaker, Legislative Assembly, intimating that the amendments made by the Council in respect of the Madras Forest (Amendment) Bill 1964 (L.A. Bill No. 39 of 1964) were taken into consideration by the Assembly at its meeting held on 12—11—1965 and that the Assembly has accepted the amendments.

Sri S. K. SAMBANDHAN : On a point of information, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member may rise on a point of information, after I finish.

III.—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE *RE*. PUBLICATION OF A DESPATCH OF A "SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR" IN "BROADWAY TIMES" UNDER THE CAPTION "D.M.K. CELLS IN MADRAS SECRETARIAT".

Mr. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Members are aware that on the 20th January 1964, a matter of privilege was raised by my predecessor in the Legislative Council *suo motu* in regard to an article published in the 'Broadway Times' in its issue, dated the 13th December 1963, under the caption, 'D.M.K. Cells in the Madras Secretariat', which *inter alia* reads as follows :—

'The Legislature Secretariat is packed with D.M.K. men. Some of the information, like answers received for starred questions, is being leaked out to D.M.K. Legislators, long before the session begins.'

13th November 1965] [Mr. Chairman]

The then Hon. Chairman ruled that there was a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege, as such written imputations, which concern the character and conduct of some members of the Secretariat of this House, are a serious breach of privilege without perhaps being libel at common law.

Then the Hon. Chairman however ruled that further action in this matter might be deferred for the present inasmuch as the matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges by the other House.

The Committee appointed by the Legislative Assembly of Madras had come to the conclusion that the allegations made in the paper were baseless as the Editor was not able to substantiate them and he had committed contempt of the House, and presented its report on the 31st March 1964. The report was considered by the Assembly on the 31st March 1965 and it resolved to suspend the press gallery pass issued to the said weekly for a session of the Assembly.

The breach of privilege committed by the Editor against this House is independent of the breach of privilege committed against the Legislative Assembly, though the cause is from the same news item in the paper. I would like to have the views of the House before I take further action in this regard.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, in view of the fact that the Assembly has punished the Weekly for contempt in respect of its article, which this House has again taken note of, it is unnecessary to inflict another punishment and, therefore, I suggest that the matter may be dropped.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : I also agree with the Hon. Leader of the House. But the breach of privilege of the Legislative Council is independent. He has clubbed both. I think, Sir, consideration should be given to the breach of privilege of this House. That is what I felt. If the Government think that the punishment given is sufficient for one session, why not the same punishment be given by this House for one session here? We can consider this. But if the Government think that the punishment already given is all right, I do not want to say anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may inform the hon. Member that that person was not having any pass at all here. So there is no question of cancelling his pass for the press gallery.

I agree with the opinion expressed in the House that we need not proceed further in this matter and the matter may be closed.